

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD
FOR THE
INTEGRATED COMMERCIAL INTRUSION DETECTION SYSTEM-IV (ICIDS-IV)

30 May 2007

52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)

BASIS FOR AWARD.

The Government will select for award the proposal that is most advantageous and represents the best overall value to the Government, considering the Technical, Past Performance and Price Factors. This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15 as supplemented. The Government may select for award the Offeror whose price is not the lowest, but whose Technical and Past Performance proposals are sufficiently more advantageous to justify the payment of a higher price. Conversely, the Government may select for award the Offeror whose price is lower, when the other Offeror's Technical and Past Performance proposals are not sufficiently more advantageous to justify the payment of a higher price. To receive consideration for award, a rating of no less than "Acceptable" must be achieved for the Technical Factor, all Technical Subfactors and the Past Performance Factor.

FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS TO BE EVALUATED.**EVALUATION FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS AND THEIR RELATIVE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE**

Factor I – Technical.

- Subfactor A: System Design
- Subfactor B: System Installation
- Subfactor C: System Demonstration
- Subfactor D: System Supportability
- Subfactor E: Management

Factor II – Past Performance

Factor III – Price

The Technical Factor is more important than the Past Performance Factor; the Past Performance Factor is more important than the Price Factor. Within the Technical Factor, the subfactors are listed in descending order of importance. All evaluation factors other than price, when combined, are significantly more important than price.

Factor I - Technical.

(a) Subfactor A – System Design. The Government evaluation will consist of a comprehensive assessment of the proposed ICIDS-IV performance of the proposed system architecture, including interfaces, design, communications, and components of the proposed system; identification and detailed description and features of the proposed system and application software, to include operating system and support software; approach to Quality Assurance and configuration control; communications media testing and system communication requirements;

methodology for adding to, removal of, or enhancing the existing Intrusion Detection System (IDS); methodology for adding to, removal of, or enhancing the existing Entry Control Equipment (ECE); methodology for adding to, removal of, or enhancing the Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) used for assessment; Gap Analysis during Site Survey/Site Specific Design phase to ensure the design meets regulatory compliance; methodology for achieving system accreditation IAW DoD Information Assurance Certification and Accreditation Process (DIACAP); methodology for handling changes and/or advances in technology and implement those changes into ICIDS-IV; methodology for managing the obsolescence of proposed ICIDS-IV equipment over the course of the contract (base year plus 5 option years); methodology for performing Site Survey/Site Specific Design (SS/SSD) including design standards, computer aided design/drafting utilization, site preparation and installation planning, communications media testing and identification of site preparation requirements; approach to technical manuals; and approach to operator, system administrator, and maintainer training courses prior to installation of the ICIDS-IV system; and technical approach, detailed design drawings, labor categories and hours, schedule, and parts list based on provided pseudo-site "Fort FPS" (Attachment 7 for Section J of the RFP) for Site Survey/Site Specific Design.

(b) Subfactor B – System Installation. The Government evaluation will consist of a comprehensive assessment of the proposed ICIDS-IV Contractors ability to obtain favorable personnel National Agency Check (NAC); personnel qualification methods; workmanship evaluation and quality assurance; material tracking; disposal methods for de-installed equipment and refuse; understanding of best commercial standards; method of coordination and communications with the various organizations (PM-FPS, Contracting Agency, Site POCs and tenant activity POCs) to ensure a successful project; and technical approach, labor categories and hours, schedule, and parts list based on provided pseudo-site "Fort FPS" (Attachment 7 for Section J of the RFP) for System Installation.

(c) Subfactor C – System Demonstration. The Government evaluation will consist of a comprehensive assessment of the proposed ICIDS-IV the proposed Performance Verification Test-1 (PVT-1) in the laboratory environment; location of the Engineering Support Test Laboratory (ESTL) for PVT-1; method of supporting and maintaining ESTL operation throughout the life of the ICIDS-IV contract; the proposed Performance Verification Test (PVT-2) and Endurance Test for the first installed site; the proposed System Acceptance Test (SPV and Endurance Test) for follow-on sites; methods of documenting test and evaluation data IAW CDRLs A014, A021, A022, A026, and A029; regression analysis/test approach; change control; and technical approach, labor categories, labor hours, and schedule based on provided pseudo-site "Fort FPS" (Attachment 7 for Section J of the RFP) for System Demonstration.

(d) Subfactor D – System Supportability. The Government evaluation will consist of a comprehensive assessment of the proposed ICIDS-IV methods for managing and validating system software/hardware configuration control; procedures for problem reporting and warranty issues; Help Desk plans and procedures; warranty maintenance planning; system backup and recovery management planning, documentation and procedures; and technical approach, labor categories, labor hours, and schedule based on provided pseudo-site "Fort FPS" (Attachment 7 for Section J of the RFP) for System Supportability.

(e) Subfactor E – Management Factor.

1. Management Approach: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed organization and procedures for management of the ICIDS-IV program. This evaluation will consist of an assessment of relevant aspects including, but not limited to, the following: 1) the adequacy of the proposed Integrated Product and Process Development (IPPD) methodology, including Integrated Product Team (IPT) implementation and management techniques, tools, and controls; 2) the adequacy of the proposed approach to planning and scheduling; 3) the approach and tools for monitoring, controlling, and reporting progress, including the progress of subcontractors; and 4) the proposed team organization and staffing.

2. Corporate Management Experience and Expertise: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's: 1) proposed corporate management experience with programs that are similar to ICIDS-IV in value, scope, and complexity; 2) qualifications, education, experience, and availability of key management personnel for their roles under the proposed effort; and 3) management procedures for implementing lessons-learned throughout the corporation.

3. Management Scenarios: Offerors shall prepare to address several management scenarios during oral presentations. These scenarios will identify several management issues such as emergency response to after-hours failure of system during the installation and warranty phases, change control process, and surge capabilities in support of multiple concurrent installation phases.

NOTE. This Subfactor refers to "experience" (what type of work was performed) as distinct from "performance risk" (which assesses how well this work was performed).

Factor II – Past Performance Factor: No subfactors.

Factor III – Price Factor: No subfactors.

EVALUATION APPROACH.

All proposals shall be subject to evaluation by a team of Government personnel and non-Government advisors from the following company: Computer Sciences Corporation

Technical Evaluation Approach.

The evaluation process will consider the following for each subfactor, as applicable and except as otherwise noted:

(a) Understanding of the Problems. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which it demonstrates a clear understanding of all features involved in solving the problems and meeting the requirements; and the extent to which uncertainties are identified and resolutions proposed.

(b) Feasibility of Approach. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the proposed approach is workable and the end results achievable. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which successful performance is contingent upon proven devices and techniques that do not require development. The proposal will be evaluated to determine whether the offeror's methods and approach in meeting the requirements in a timely manner provide the Government with a high level of confidence of successful completion. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the offeror is expected to be able to successfully complete the proposed tasks and technical requirements within the required schedule.

(c) Flexibility. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the approach facilitates the implementation of both cost effective and simplified integration of new processes and technology enhancements, and unanticipated future changes to the overall system.

(d) Completeness. Each proposal will be rated strictly in accordance with its written content based on the extent to which requirements have been considered, defined and satisfied.

Evaluators will not assume that the Offeror's performance will include areas not specified in its proposal.

Past Performance Evaluation Approach.

The Past Performance evaluation will assess the relative risks associated with an offeror's likelihood of success in performing the solicitation's requirements as indicated by that offeror's relative record of past performance. In this context, "offeror" refers to the proposed prime contractor and all proposed major subcontractors. A major subcontractor is defined as one who will be providing critical hardware or whose subcontract is for more than 20% of the total proposed price. In either case, the prime contractor and proposed major subcontractors will be assessed individually and the results will then be assessed in their totality to derive the offeror's Past Performance rating.

(a) The Government will conduct a Performance Risk assessment using both independent data and data provided by Offerors. Offerors will be evaluated based on the quality, relevancy and recency of the offeror's past performance, as well as that of its major subcontractors, as it relates to the probability of successful accomplishment of the required effort. Recent performance is defined as contracts performed and/or completed within the past three years. Areas of relevance include projects cited as comparable to the current program in terms of scope, complexity, and/or price. When assessing performance risk, the Government will focus its inquiry on the past performance of the offeror and its proposed major subcontractors as it relates to all solicitation requirements. These requirements include all aspects of schedule, performance and supportability, including the offeror's record of: 1) the extent to which the contractor submitted required reports, CDRL documentation in a timely manner; 2) the extent to which the contractor's reports, CDRL documentation were accurate and complete; 3) how well the contractor performed according to the agreed-to schedule, what were the causes of any schedule variances, and did the contractor require assistance to resolve any schedule problems; 4) how well the contractor proactively managed schedule/performance/cost and risks and to what extent was the contractor successful at solving contract performance problems/issues without extensive

guidance from the Government (or customer); 5) to what extent the contractor committed adequate resources, in a timely fashion to the contract, to meet the requirements and to successfully solve problems; 6) how well the contractor performed multiple projects simultaneously while in different phases of the installation process; 7) to what extent the contractor was successful in resolving unanticipated technical issues in a timely manner; 8) to what extent the training, provided by the contractor, was useful, comprehensive, and successful in providing the necessary knowledge and/or skills; 9) to what extent the contract adhered to contract requirements for warranty and/or maintenance (including response/repair time; appropriate personnel to diagnose and repair the problem; appropriate parts/replacement to make repair); 10) to what extent the contractor displayed cooperation with the Government (or customer) in resolving contract issues or problems; 11) to what extent did the contractor deliver at the agreed-to cost; 12) overall rating of the contractor's performance; 13) the contractor's overall strengths and weaknesses; 14) would you award to this contractor again; 15) the extent to which the contractor established and maintained adequate management of subcontractors; 16) the extent to which the contractor conformed to specifications and standards of good workmanship; 17) the extent to which the contractor resolved technical and manufacturing problems quickly and effectively.

(b) A significant achievement, problem or lack of relevant data in any element of the work can become an important consideration in the source selection process. A negative finding under any element may result in an overall high-risk rating. Therefore, offerors are reminded to include all relevant past efforts, including demonstrated corrective actions, in their proposal. Relevant performance is defined as contracts that are for efforts that have a logical connection with the efforts required by the solicitation.

(c) Offerors are cautioned that in conducting the performance risk assessment, the Government may use data provided in the offeror's proposal and data obtained from other sources. Since the Government may not necessarily interview all of the sources provided by the offerors, it is incumbent upon the offerors to explain the relevance of the data provided. Offerors are reminded that while the Government may elect to consider data obtained from other sources, the burden of proving low performance risk rests with the offerors.

(d) In the event an offeror has no record of relevant past performance or past performance is not available, the offeror will receive a neutral evaluation which will neither be favorable nor unfavorable.

Price Evaluation Approach.

All proposed contract prices will be considered in the overall price evaluation. The Government will analyze each offeror's pricing information in terms of completeness, reasonableness, and realism. The Government will evaluate the realism of the offeror's proposed prices in relation to the offeror's specific technical approach. Any proposal, which is evaluated by the Government as significantly unrealistic in price may be considered by the Government to reflect either a lack of technical competence to accomplish the Government's requirements or a failure to understand the Government's requirements, or both. The offeror's proposed price will be evaluated by determining what the Government predicts the offeror's approach would most probably cost the

Government when the work performed under the contract is completed. Offers that are determined to be materially unbalanced may be rejected. An offer is mathematically unbalanced if it is based on prices which are significantly less than the price for some contract line items and significantly overstated in relation to price for others.

Oral Discussions.

General Information. Oral discussion sessions may be held, at the discretion of the Government, for each offeror determined to be in the competitive range. Since the oral discussion sessions constitute "discussions" in accordance with FAR 15.306(d) and 15.307(b), the Contracting Officer will request the submission of final proposal revisions. Final proposal revisions will be requested by the Government only after all oral discussion sessions are complete. Offerors will be allowed a minimum of two (2) calendar days to submit final proposal revisions.

Oral Discussion Scheduling. The Contracting Officer will schedule the oral discussion sessions to take place approximately 10 days after receipt of offers or as soon as practicable, and each offeror will be notified of the actual time and place at least three (3) days prior to their oral discussion session. Appropriate security clearances should be provided in sufficient time to process the requests. The contracting officer will provide additional instructions with the notification. The oral discussion sessions will be made at the Government's facility at Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

END OF SECTION M